



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By JOHN F. HURST,
Washington, D. C.

WHEN Elizabeth came to the throne, in 1558, it was uncertain what course she would pursue—whether that of her half-brother, Edward, or that of her half-sister, Mary. During the reign of the latter she had conformed to the Roman Catholic religion. She still heard mass, and was crowned with all the old Roman Catholic ceremonial. Bishop Bonner, however, was immediately imprisoned in the Marshalsea, London, where he was kept until his death, in 1569; the queen forbade the elevation of the host in her presence; eight men of reforming views were added to the council; and the queen entertained a petition, or paper, from one of the councilors recommending (1) the restoration of the Church of England to its former purity; (2) the gradual abasement of those favorable to the late queen; (3) the giving over to the crown of the wealth of those bishops and clergy who had enriched themselves in the late reign, this to be secured by the pressure of the *Præmunire* statute; (4) the disregard of those who wished to carry reform farther; (5) the revision of the English Prayer Book; and (6) until this revision was accomplished the prohibition of all innovation. It was evident, therefore, that with all of Elizabeth's Roman Catholic views she had no intention whatever of keeping England in unity with the pope. Or, as Canon Perry comments on these proposals: "The main body of the nation, indifferent to the form of religion, was to be bribed by the spoil of the church, and the restoration to the crown of those sources of revenue, the alienation of which they had so grudgingly conceded in the late reign; while the lovers of the Reformation were to be propitiated by the restoration of the reformed worship, changed, however, in some particulars to conciliate and attract the more moderate of the Romanists."¹

¹ *History of the Church of England*, "Students' Series," London, 1887, 6th ed., 1894, Vol. II, p. 255.

I. THE RESETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH.

In 1548 Edward VI. published a new communion service in English, the same substantially as that now used.² In 1549 the first Prayer Book came forth from a committee of divines. It was based primarily on the old Latin service-books, and secondarily on Archbishop Hermann's Consultation, which was drawn up by Melancthon and Bucer on the basis of Luther's Nuremberg services.³ This book was too Roman Catholic to suit Edward and some of the council; it was therefore subjected to a revision.⁴ The new book was published in 1552. It was more Protestant than the other, thus sacrificing much, says Perry, that succeeding generations of churchmen would have gladly retained.⁵ In the book of 1549 the direction in the delivery of the bread in the sacrament was: "And when he delivereth the sacrament of the body of Christ he shall say to everyone these words: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.'" In the book of 1552 the words were: "And when he delivereth the bread he shall say: 'Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.'" ⁶ Protestants, however, considered even the second book of Edward as too Catholic. Calvin called it "intolerable stuff" and "tolerable fooleries." It was this book which Elizabeth

² This service is given in full in appendix to CARDWELL, *Two Liturgies of Edward VI. Compared*, pp. 425 ff.

³ The divines who did most of the work were Cranmer (chief); Ridley; Goodryke, bishop of Ely; Holbeach, bishop of Lincoln; May, dean of St. Paul's; Dr. John Taylor, dean (afterward bishop) of Lincoln; Haynes, dean of Exeter; and Cox, the king's almoner, afterward bishop of Ely. See PROCTER, *History of Book of Common Prayer, with the Sources and Rationale of its Offices*, ed. of 1892, p. 268, note 4. Francis Procter was the vicar of a village in Norfolk, and this modest, but scholarly book, first printed in 1855, is an illustration of how good work makes for itself a perennial life.

⁴ The chief revisers were Cox, Taylor, Cranmer, and Ridley.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 212.

⁶ The two Prayer Books are reprinted in full in parallel columns, with a valuable introduction by E. CARDWELL, Oxford, 3d ed., 1852. The words quoted from the second book were taken from the Liturgy of John à Lasco, a Polish nobleman and clergyman, who had established, in 1549, a foreign Protestant congregation in London. See CARDWELL, p. xxviii, note q.

ordered revised in 1558,⁷ and, for fear that in the meantime her subjects would worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, she put out this proclamation: She "charges and commands all manner of her subjects, as well those called to the ministry of the church as all others, that they do forbear to teach and preach, or to give audience to any manner of teaching or preaching, other than to the gospel and epistle of the day, and to the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue, without exposition of any manner, sense, or meaning to be applied and added; or to use any other manner of public prayer, rite, or ceremony in the church but that which is already used, and by law received as the common litany, used at this present in her majesty's own chapel, and the Lord's Prayer and the Creed in English, until consultation may be had by Parliament, by her majesty, and her three estates of this realm, for the better conciliation and accord of such cases as at this present are moved in matters and ceremonies of religion."⁸

This proclamation, which ended by promising punishment to all who disobeyed, assured both Protestants and Catholics that the Church of England was to be restored according to Henry's plan, and that they should govern themselves accordingly—an assurance that was backed up by the declaration of the lord chancellor at the opening of Parliament in January, 1559.

The Prayer Book committee was anxious to conciliate the Protestant element, while Elizabeth was thinking of the Roman Catholics. She had Cecil, therefore, deliver to the revisers a paper asking them whether they could not provide for the retention of the image of the cross, of processions, of copes for holy communion, of the presence of non-communicants at that sacrament, of prayers for the dead, of the prayer of consecration of the elements in the supper, of the placing of the elements in the mouth, and of kneeling at reception.

⁷ The committee of revision was Parker, Pilkington, Bill, May, Cox, Grindal, and Whitehead, supervised by Cecil, the new premier, with the assistance of Guest. Parker was prevented by illness, and Guest, afterward bishop of Rochester, seems to have been the dominating mind on the committee.

⁸ This interesting document is given in full by CARDWELL, *Documentary Annals of the Church of England*, Vol. I, pp. 176-7 (Oxford, 1839).

These requests were not granted, and Guest, the principal reviser, wrote a letter to Cecil giving reasons. "Ceremonies once taken away as ill-used should not be taken again. No image should be used in the church. Procession is superfluous; it is better to pray in the church. Because it is sufficient to use but a surplice in baptizing, reading, preaching, and praying, therefore it is enough also for the communion. Non-communicants should be dismissed before the consecration, and (as it seems) after the offertory. The Creed is ordained to be said only of the communicants. Prayer for the dead is not used, because it seems to make for sacrifice; as used in the first Book it makes some of the faithful to be in heaven and to need no mercy, and some of them to be in another place and to lack help and mercy. The prayer in the first Book for consecration of elements, beginning 'O Merciful Father,' is to be disliked because it is taken to be so needful to the consecration that the consecration is not thought to be without it; Christ, in ordaining the sacrament, made no petition, but a thanksgiving. The sacrament is to be received in our hands. The old use of the church was to communicate standing; yet, because it is taken of some by itself to be a sin to receive kneeling, whereas of itself it is lawful, it is left indifferent to every man's choice to follow the one way or the other, and to teach men that it is lawful to receive either standing or kneeling."⁹

It was, therefore, the second Prayer Book of Edward, rather than the first, which the Elizabethan divines, in the hope of conciliating the Protestant—soon to be called Puritan—party, revived. In the delivery of the elements the words of the first and second books were united. With some slight additions made by the queen, this Prayer Book was enforced on the nation by the parliament of 1559 in the Act of Uniformity.¹⁰ The penalty for the first offense was a fine of 100 marks, for the second 400, and for the third confiscation of goods and life imprisonment. Many of the bishops, however, and nine temporal lords opposed the bill

⁹ STRYPE, *Annals*, Vol. I, app. xiv; PROCTER, p. 57, note 4.

¹⁰ This act is printed in full in GEE and HARDY, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, pp. 458 ff.

in the Upper House, and it passed by a majority of only three. But the Prayer Book was at once received and used everywhere."¹¹

Immediately before this Uniformity Act was passed Parliament restored to the crown its spiritual headship in an act, January, 1559, so stringent and sweeping that it would have delighted Henry's own heart. It empowered the queen to give commissions to such persons as she thought fit to "visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offenses, contempts, and enormities which by any manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction can or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, or amended."¹² It makes a limitation, however, to irresponsible judgments in that it says that nothing shall be adjudged heresy which has not already been so adjudged by the Scriptures, or by the first four councils, or by any other council which judged according to the Scriptures, or in the future by the Parliament and Convocation. This, in reality, was no safeguard to the rights of conscience, because it left the determination of what was thus condemned to the court and not to the "heretic." But it clearly showed what has already been proven, namely, the intermediate position of the Church of England, holding aloft both the Scriptures and the *acta concilia* as tests of orthodoxy, with final appeal, with true Erastian instinct, to Parliament. The act also changed the title of the queen from "supreme head" to "supreme governor"—a distinction without a difference. Elizabeth abated her authority not one jot.

Injunctions were also issued forbidding, among other things, the extolling of images, clerical marriages without the permission of the bishop and two justices of the peace, the wearing of vestments, except those in use under Edward, and the taking away of altars, except under the supervision of the curate and church wardens, in which case the place of the altar is to be taken by a table. Although the injunctions did not command the removal of images, it appears that in some places these, with

¹¹ Parkhurst to Bullinger, May, 1559: "The book set forth in time of King Edward is now in general use throughout England." (*Zürich Letters*, Vol. I, pp. 29, 31.)

¹² For the text of this act see GEE and HARDY, pp. 442 ff.

other objects of veneration, were both removed and burned.¹³ Matthew Parker was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, December 17, 1559. The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion were published in 1563. Some efforts toward making the church more Protestant were thwarted. For instance, a petition of the Lower House of Convocation to the Upper House was drawn up embodying the following reforms: (1) only Sundays to be kept as holy days; (2) in church the minister to read the service with his face to the congregation, and distinctly; (3) the sign of the cross in baptism to be disused; (4) kneeling at the communion not to be obligatory; (5) a surplice is sufficient vestment for all occasions; (6) let organs be prohibited. These salutary provisions were rejected, but only by a majority of one. Another attempt toward Protestantism was the catechism of Dean Nowell, accepted by Parker and, with alterations, by the Lower House of Convocation; but for some reason it failed to get through the Upper House, to the joy of all Anglicans since. The catechism was of a Calvinistic and Puritan cast. "It would have proved a serious burden to the Church of England," says Canon Perry.¹⁴ "We may be satisfied," says Dean Hook, "with expressing our deep sense of gratitude to the merciful Providence which has exonerated us from a burden which it would be difficult to sustain."¹⁵

A second Book of Homilies was published in 1563, intended especially for the use of ignorant and otherwise incompetent clergy, of whom the Church of England was then full. Ministers held a plurality of livings; they were non-graduates and illiterate; very few had real capacity; many parishes were without priests at all; and a contemporary remark on the clergy of Hereford seems applicable over a wide area: "The clergy of the cathedral are said to be disreputable as well as ignorant."¹⁶

The consecration of Parker as bishop has been made the subject of fierce controversy, because on it turns the validity of the

¹³ HEYLIN, *History of Elizabeth*, p. 118; *Zürich Letters*, Vol. I, p. 74.

¹⁴ *History of the Church of England*, "Students' Series," Vol. II, p. 280.

¹⁵ *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, Vol. IX, p. 354.

¹⁶ *State Papers of Elizabeth* (Domestic), Vol. XVII, p. 32.

orders, in the Catholic sense, of the Church of England. Various objections have been made to it:

1. The Nag's Head fable was set forth in 1603, and is to the effect that at Nag's Head Tavern, at Cheapside, Parker and other bishops were ordained in a hasty and indifferent manner, namely, by Scory placing a Bible on their heads or shoulders and saying, "Take the authority to preach the word of God sincerely."¹⁷ This fable is now recognized as such by even Roman controversialists.

2. The fact of the consecration in Lambeth Chapel has been denied by some on the ground of alleged irregularities in the Lambeth episcopal register. These irregularities, if they exist, can be explained by the methods of the copyists. Cooke says that there were those at the time who denied the existence of the register,¹⁸ but the only one he quotes is Harding, the Roman Catholic antagonist of Jewel, who says: "We say to you, Mr. Jewel, show us the register of your bishop." But on turning to the original of this quotation—Cooke does not give the place—we find that Harding does not refer to the Parker register at all, and never mentions Parker, but is quoting Tertullian in a free translation for the purpose of impugning the apostolic succession of the Church of England: "Tell us the original and first spring of your church. Show us the register (*ordinem*) of your bishops continually succeeding one another from the beginning, so that the first bishop have some one of the apostles or apostolic men for his author and predecessor."¹⁹

Harding argues against the English hierarchy on the ground that they had separated from Catholic belief, that their bishops did not have confirmation of the bishop of Rome, and that, even if they received consecration, those conferring it had no authority, and therefore the ceremony was invalid. Jewel replies that he (Jewel) was consecrated by three bishops and the metropolitan,

¹⁷ TIERNEY'S *Dodd*, Vol. II, appendix xlii; PERRY, Vol. II, p. 282.

¹⁸ COOKE, *Historic Episcopate*, New York, 1896, p. 47.

¹⁹ "Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum; evoluant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis." (TERTULLIAN, *De Prescript. Hæc.*, xxxii.) See Harding, in JEWEL, *Works*, Vol. III, p. 321 (Parker Soc.).

but challenges Harding to bring a canon making a confirmation by the pope necessary. He also quotes canonists to prove that a consecration by even one bishop is valid. Jewel says again: "Our bishops are made in form and order, as they have been ever, by free election of the chapter; by consecration of the archbishop and three other bishops; and by the admission of the prince."²⁰ In addition to this it is a fact that for forty-four years every Roman writer in England proceeds on the assumption of the actual ordination of Parker, as commonly held, and that not one of them ever denied it.²¹

There are, indeed, few events in history up to that time more certainly and amply attested by contemporaneous evidence than the consecration of Parker, and the methods of reasoning adopted by its impugnors would lead to universal skepticism. "Of this consecration there remains a long and minute detailed account in the register of Lambeth, and a contemporaneous transcript of the consecration part of it in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. There are notices of it also in a great number of diocesan registers; in the registers of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury; in thirty or forty documents in the Rolls; in a large mass of contemporary letters and documents preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; in papers preserved in Zürich, and not known in England until 1685; in Parker's own book, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, printed in 1572; and in many other places."²² The fact of the consecration, therefore, is indisputable, and in Leo XIII.'s bull "Apostolicæ Curæ" (1896) against Anglican orders he omits entirely mention of defects of this nature.

3. It has been said that the consecration is invalid because Barlow, the chief consecrator, was himself not consecrated. Even if this were true of Barlow, the conclusion would not follow, if the other consecrators were ordained. But there is not the slightest evidence for it, except the loss of the certificate of

²⁰ *Works*, Vol. III, pp. 330, 334.

²¹ HADDAN, *Apostolic Succession in the Church of England*, London, 1869, pp. 181, 201.

²² PERRY, *History of the English Church*, London, Murray, 1887, Vol. II, p. 270.

Barlow's consecration, which is no evidence that the consecration did not take place, because the registers of men concerning whose ordination as bishops there has never been a dispute, like Gardiner of Winchester, are irrevocably lost. Even the Roman Catholic historian Lingard says: "When we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a bishop with the other consecrated bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to his seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both church and state, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body."²³ It is said by Cooke that in the making of a bishop ordination was not considered necessary in Reformation England, appointment by the sovereign being all that was required.²⁴ Passages that look that way in the writings of the times refer to what was absolutely requisite to the existence of the church of Christ, and not to what was ordinarily requisite to the well-being of the church. Why were all the English bishops ordained in the usual way? As a matter of fact, both Henry and Elizabeth were Catholic in their conceptions of church order, and would have regarded with horror an unordained priest or bishop officiating in the sacred service. Cooke says also that the Edwardine Ordinal recognizes no distinction in order between a bishop and a presbyter.²⁵ It is true that the ordinal (not of 1549, as Cooke calls it, when no ordinal existed, but the ordinal of 1550, as afterward revised and published first in the Prayer Book of 1552) does not use the word "order" or "ordering" in its "Form of consecrating an Archbishop or Bishop," but has a separate service for the consecration of a bishop, a service which makes it in effect a third order. At the bottom, and according to the apostolic church, the mediæval canonists freely acknowledged

²³ *History of England*, 6th rev. ed., Vol. VI, app. DD.

²⁴ *Historic Episcopate*, pp. 49, 52.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

the identity of priest and bishop. Could the Anglicans do less? But both churches held to the necessity of episcopal ordination for the due and safe constituting of a church. This the ordinal assumes throughout.²⁶

4. A defect in the form of ordination, the words used being: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up," as in 2 Tim. 1:6, 7. Whereas it is claimed that the name of the office or order to which the person ordained is admitted should be part of the form. But this is the exact form used in some of the Latin services of the old church, and never questioned. The essence of ordination in the Catholic sense is prayer and imposition of hands, and the form of words is indifferent.²⁷

5. A defect in intention. Did the English ordinal intend to consecrate a priest or bishop in the Catholic sense? This is the gravamen of the Roman objections. Leo XIII. says, "No," because a Catholic intention in ordination points to one who is to sacrifice the unbloody offering of the mass, and not to a minister or priest who is to consecrate elements which are sacramentally the body and blood of Christ and to be received spiritually. Everything that sets forth the "dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite has been deliberately removed from the Anglican ordinal."²⁸ In the whole ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the sacerdotium, and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of these things" in the Latin rites was purposely struck out.²⁹ This is the vital point, and from the Roman point of view it completely vitiates English orders. The only reply from the Anglican side is to say: We intend to do what the ancient church intended to do in conferring orders, and if you require more than that, so much the worse for you. Then Rome could say: The Catholic church is a living organism, and to be part of it you must be in harmony with mediæval and

²⁶ For the text of the Edwardine Ordinal see CARDWELL, *The Two Liturgies of Edward VI.*, pp. 398 ff.

²⁷ See BRIGHTMAN, "What Objections have been Made to English Orders," London, 1897, in *Publications of Church Historical Society*, Vol. I, pp. 153 ff.

²⁸ LEO'S "Bull on English Orders," § 7.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, § 8.

present Christendom as well as with what you think was the ancient teaching.

II. THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD CATHOLICS.

If 286 people (including 46 women) perished for Protestantism under Mary—not including those who died in prison, computed at 68—204 perished for Catholicism under Elizabeth.³⁰ Of these latter 15 are said by Milner to have died for denying the queen's spiritual supremacy, 126 for exercising the priesthood, and the others for returning to the old church or for succoring priests. This does not include those who died for real or imaginary plots, nor the 90 who died in prison, nor the 105 who were banished. "I say nothing," says Milner, "of many more who were whipped, fined (the fine for recusancy—not attending church—was £20 a month), or stripped of their property to the utter ruin of their families. In one night 50 Catholic gentlemen in the county of Lancaster were suddenly seized and committed to prison, on account of their non-attendance at church. At the same time I find an equal number of Yorkshire gentlemen lying prisoners in York castle, on the same account, most of whom perished there. These were every week, for a twelve-month together, dragged by main force to hear the established service performed in the castle chapel." Under the pretext of treason, to which, of course, they made themselves liable for refusing to acknowledge the queen as the religious dictator of England, many of them were put to death with the horrible barbarity which the laws sanctioned, namely, hung, cut down alive, disemboweled, and beheaded. Tudor history has made us familiar with all this, and it is not necessary to dwell upon it; but there was one peculiarity of the penal processes under Elizabeth which gives her reign a bad preëminence—the universal use of torture. This was employed occasionally by her predecessors, but in her reign this

³⁰ See full table of Marian martyrs in PERRY, Vol. II, p. 251. For Elizabethan martyrs see BUTLER, *Memoirs of English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics*, Vol. I, pp. 176 ff.; LEE, *Church under Queen Elizabeth*, Vol. I, pp. 140 ff.; Vol. II, *passim*; BRADY, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland*, Rome, 1877, pp. 37-60; MILNER, *Letters to a Prebendary*, 1st ed., of ten reprinted.

horrible method of eliciting the desired information or confessions was employed by wholesale.³¹

For this persecution it cannot be denied that there was provocation.

1. Pius V., a pope of austere morals and profound convictions of duty, but without statesmanship or insight—still acting as though the world was yet in the twelfth century—issued a bull of excommunication against Elizabeth, February 25, 1570, in which she is deprived of her crown and her subjects absolved from allegiance.³² Although this bull fell absolutely flat, and was either practically or expressly repudiated by almost every responsible Catholic in England, yet it gave occasion for untold suffering.

2. This bull gave excuse to Philip of Spain to fit out his Invincible Armada, 1588, as the Spaniards foolishly called it—*armada* being the Spanish name for any armed fleet. How this great enterprise of one hundred and twenty ships went to pieces against the better ships, the heavier guns, and the more trained marksmanship and seamanship of the English sailors—helped by adverse winds and storms—is a familiar story. The victory of 1588 was repeated for exactly the same reasons—barring storms—by the American victories of Manila and Santiago in 1898. Here again the loyalty of the Catholics was unimpeachable. The admiral of the English fleet was himself a Catholic—Lord Howard of Effingham—and Catholics freely offered themselves for their country. “The very presence of such a man as Admiral Howard,” says the historian Gardiner, “was a token of patriotic fervor of which Philip and the Jesuits had taken no

³¹ For full details see BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 180 ff.; BURKE, *Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty*, Vol. IV, pp. 97 ff.; LEE, Vol. II, pp. 279 ff., and elsewhere.

³² For the text of this bull in Latin and English see SANDERS, *De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani*, lib. iv, c. 8 (tr. by Lewis, London, 1877), first published 1585; TIERNEY, *Dodd's Church History of England*, Vol. III, p. ii; W. E. COLLINS, *The English Reformation and its Consequences*, London, 1898, pp. 242 ff. The bull was rescinded by Gregory XIII., April 5, 1580, so far as it bound English Catholics in their present circumstances, but was renewed by Sixtus V. on condition of the success of the Armada. For Sixtus' bull see BUTLER, Vol. I, p. 197, and for his interest in the Armada see HÜBNER, *Sixtus V.*, Vol. I, pp. 352 ff.

account, but which made the great majority of Catholics draw their sword for their queen and country.”³³

3. The establishment of a seminary for the education of English priests at Douai in Flanders in 1568, and the mission of these priests for the reconversion of England. The missionaries were bent on religious work only, refrained from political intrigue, and rejoiced in martyrdom for their faith. No doubt they would have welcomed the succession of a Catholic, and some of them may have been parties to plots, but it is incontestable that the missionaries as a class confined themselves to ministering in spiritual things in furtive ways and in constant dread of death. The assertion of some Anglican historians³⁴ that these priests were traitors seems absolutely without warrant. The facts are that of the two hundred Catholics, more or less, who were executed under Elizabeth, only one impugned her right to the throne; that the priests persisted to the moment of death in denying their guilt, except in matters of faith and their mission as priests; and that no treason was proved. Although the trials were, as usual in those days, conducted with barbarous disregard for justice, there is not an instance in which the tortures on which their judges depended produced a confession of guilt—even if a confession extorted by torture is valueless as evidence. One of the most pious and heroic of these priests, Edmund Campion, spoke for his brethren as well as himself in his trial. “You refuse,” said the persecutor, “to swear to the oath of supremacy.” “I acknowledge,” answers Campion, “her highness as my governor and sovereign. I acknowledged before the commissioners her majesty to be my queen both *de facto et de jure*.” When the question was put to him whether a papal excommunication of a sovereign absolved him from allegiance, he answered that, though he could not admit that it would, yet the question was a scholastic one, in dispute among theologians, and, as it formed no part of the indictment, it ought not to be asked. At his execution he again protested his innocence of offense against the queen. “In this I am innocent; this is my last breath;

³³ *Student's History of England*, p. 460.

³⁴ For instance, PERRY, Vol. II, p. 357.

in this give me credit. I have, and I do pray for her." Lord Charles Howard asked him for which queen he prayed; for Elizabeth, the queen? Campion replied: "Yes, for Elizabeth, your queen and my queen."³⁵

4. Plots. This was an age of assassination, and there is no wonder if plots were hatched to make away with Elizabeth. Nor can there be any doubt that at that time both Protestants and Catholics believed that the sudden and violent taking off of a ruler who to them was a tyrant and persecutor was considered perfectly justifiable.

Lord Acton says: "Melancthon prayed for a brave man to dispatch Henry VIII.; the brave man who dispatched the duke of Guise was praised by Beza to the skies; Knox wished the doom of Rizzio to be inflicted on every Catholic; the Swedish bishops recommended that a dose of poison should be mixed with the king's food."³⁶ A fanatical Dominican stabbed Henry III. of France in 1598, and Henry IV. was put to death in the same way by Ravallac in 1610, the king's life having been attempted nineteen times. Gerrards, in 1584, shot William of Orange. The wonder is that more plots were not the outcome of the horrible dealings of this reign, for, as Hallam says, the disaffection of Catholics, so far as it existed, was due to their unjust persecution.³⁷ (a) The insurrection of the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland in 1569, though in the Catholic interest, was left in the lurch by the Catholics. (b) The supposed plot of Throgmorton in connection with the duke of Guise, 1583, rests on no substantial basis. When racked he protested innocence; then, on further racking, he confessed,

³⁵ BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 190, 191, 239, 240. See the remarkable testimony of Plowden, remarks on a book entitled *Memoirs of Gregorio Panzain*, 1794, quoted by BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 200-206. In view of the facts stated above notice such a statement as this: "It is probable that at no time during the reign of Elizabeth would a Romanist priest who was ready to disclaim the deposing power of the pope, and to profess his loyal allegiance to the queen, have incurred sentence of death." (PERRY, Vol. II, p. 357.)

³⁶ *Quarterly Review*, London, January, 1887, art. I.

³⁷ *Constitutional History of England*, Vol. I, pp. 160, 161. He attributes the "whole, or nearly the whole, of their disaffection to her unjust aggressions on the liberty of conscience."

afterward retracted his confession, and died asserting innocence. (c) Parry, first a Protestant spy employed by the queen's ministers, then a Catholic and a member of Parliament, where he used his influence for toleration, was arrested on a charge of a plot to assassinate the queen, wrote a confession of it—perhaps with a view to pardon—and afterward, when condemned, retracted his confession, saying it was extorted from him by dread of torture, and cried out that he “never meant to kill the queen, and that he would lay his blood upon her and his judges before God and the world;” and to this he adhered till his execution, March, 1585. It is no wonder that Hallam refuses to pronounce on his guilt.³⁸ (d) John Somerville, a son-in-law of Edward Arden, a relative of Mary (Arden) Shakespeare, the mother of the dramatist, was convicted of conspiracy with his father-in-law. The plot was probably the invention of Leicester, the enemy of the Ardens.³⁹ (e) The only plot that is well on the field of history is that of Babington, in which Mary, queen of Scots, then a prisoner at Fotheringhay, nine miles from Peterboro, was implicated. Even of the genuineness of this plot there are grave doubts, and historians are hopelessly divided. Walsingham, one of the great men that survived Elizabeth, had reduced deception to an exact science, and it is impossible to say that the whole business was not an invention of his. A recent writer says that the “real fountain head of Babington's, or, as some have called it, Walsingham's conspiracy, and the chief confederates, were spies in the pay of Walsingham, and all the correspondence of Mary and her friends passed through his hands.” Mary charged him with having forged the correspondence against her. “His administration of foreign affairs was founded on a system of bribery, espionage, and deception. He is said to have had in his pay fifty-three agents and eighteen spies in various countries.⁴⁰ In an age when diplomacy was universally tainted with intrigue and lies, the astute Walsingham

³⁸ *Constitutional History of England*, Vol. I, p. 161, note. See BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 249–54.

³⁹ BUTLER, Vol. I, p. 254; BAYNES, “Shakespeare,” in *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed., Vol. XXI, p. 790. Hallam calls Somerville a half-lunatic.

⁴⁰ Art. “Walsingham, Sir Francis,” in *Chambers' Encycl.*, ed. 1893, Vol. X, p. 540.

would, no doubt, have considered that he was doing God's service in encompassing the death of one who, he must have believed, endangered England while she lived. The trial of Mary was, as Hallam says, an illustration of that "shameful breach of legal rules almost universal in trials of high treason during the reign of Elizabeth."⁴²

Such are the palliations of the restored church-state's persecutions of the Catholics. When we consider the splendid loyalty of the Roman Catholics in the face of unparalleled provocation, the murderous venom of her tortures and hangings stains the history of the Church of England in her hour of triumph with ineffaceable dishonor and reproach.

⁴² *Loc. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 164.